have of them, are not real qualities absolutely existing without us, but ev T?JUIV <f>a<rjuara, fancies or phantasms in us : so that both the Latin interpreters Ficinus and Serranus, though probably neither of them at all acquainted with this philosophy, as being not yet restored, could not but understand it after the same manner; the one expressing it thus—" Color ex aspectu tnotuque medium quiddam .resultans est. Tails circa oculos pas-sio ;" and the other, " E£ varia aspicientis diathesi, vatiaque sensilis specie colores varios et vid£ri et fieri, ita tamen ut sint ^avraorrd, nee nisi in anirno subsistant." However, it appears by Plato's manner of telling the story, and the tenour of the whole dialogue, that hithself was not a little prejudiced agaitist this philosophy. In all probability the rather, because Protagoras had made it a foundation both for Scepticism and Atheism,

vin. We have now learnt from Plato, that De~ mocritus and Leucippus were not the sole proprietaries in this philosophy, but that Protagoras, though not vulgarly taken notice of for aay such thing (being commonly represented as a Sophist only) was a sharer in it likewise; which Protagoras, indeed, Laertius,* and others, affirm to have been an auditor of Democritus ; and so he might be, notwithstanding what Plutarch tells us,[b] that Dernocritus wrote against his taking away the absolute nature of things. However, we are of opinion, that neither Deinocritus, nor Protagoras, nor Leucippus, was the 'first inventor of this philosophy; and oar reason is, because they were all three of them Atheists (though

* Lib* ix. segm. 50. p. 575, 576. Videas etaam A. Gellium Noct., Attic- lib. v. c. iii. **et** Suidam voce riprayopa;. [b] Libro adversus Colotem, torn- ii. oper.p. 1108, 1109-